

Juvenile Justice Task Force

September 15, 2011 - 9:00 am-12:00 pm
JAC Center, Lakewood, CO

Attendees:

Regina Huerter, Denver Crime Prevention and Control Commission
 Karen Ashby, Juvenile Court Presiding Judge
 Meg Williams, Division of Criminal Justice
 Stan T. Paprocki, Division of Behavioral Health
 Norene Simpson, Indigent Defense Counsel
 Jeff MacDonald, Jefferson County JAC
 John Gomez, Division of Youth Corrections
 Bill Kilpatrick, Golden Police Department
 Dana Wilks for Susan Colling, State Court Administrators Office
 Charles Garcia, Juvenile Parole Board
 Kim Dvorchak, Co. Juvenile Defender Coalition
 Joe Higgins, Mesa County Partners
 Linda Newell, State Senate
 Don Quick, 17th District Attorney’s Office

Staff

Ken Plotz, Task Force Consultant
 Laurence Lucero, Division of Criminal Justice

Task Force Members Absent:

Inta Morris, Department of Higher Education
 Ellen Roberts, State Senate
 Regis Groff, Retired State Senator
 Kirk Henwood, Montrose County SD RE-1J
 Beth McCann, House of Representative
 Michelle Brinegar, 8th District Attorney’s Office
 Beth McCann, House of Representative
 Susan Colling, State Court Administrator's Office
 Julie Krow, Department of Human Services

Guests:

Anna Lopez – Division of Criminal Justice
 Jerry Adamek – FNF Association
 Hailey Wilmer – Denver District Attorney

<p>Issue/Topic: Welcome and Introductions</p>	<p>Regina Huerter welcomed the group. Task force members and guests introduced themselves.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: Report of Working Groups</p>	<p>• SB 11-133 School Discipline Task Force. Senator Newell reported that the Task Force has identified the following priorities to study: zero tolerance policies, local partners, restorative justice, trainings for SROs, trainings for Educators, data tracking and reporting, information sharing, suspension and expulsion provisions, guidelines for school conduct, discipline codes, parental education and revision of legal definitions listed in the Colorado Statutes. The revisions of definitions include: <i>Serious Offense, Dangerous weapon, Delinquent, Defiance, Detrimental behavior, Discipline, Disobedience, Habitually disruptive, student, incident, and Referral to a Law enforcement agency (currently appearing in “Action Taken” section).</i></p> <p><u>Discussion Points:</u> - Information sharing from schools: Need to define the network dealing with data for release of information.</p>

	<p>- Discussions around HB 14-51: Collaborative Management of Multi-Agency Services Provided to Children and Families.</p> <p>- Use of Juvenile Assessment Center (JAC) or alternative resources. The group will further discuss Risk and Need.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judicial working group – Judge Ashby reported that the group studied data presented by Al Estrada from the Division of Youth Corrections on Division of Youth Corrections commitment. • Assessment working group – Jeff MacDonald reported that the group is currently working on identifying assessment instruments and on revising the Colorado Reference Guide Juvenile Screening and Assessment Instrument (JSAG) prepared in 2007 by the Interagency Advisory Committee on Adult and Juvenile Correctional Treatment (IACAJECT). • Education working group – The group is working on the consistency of transfer of credits between districts for youth committed in NYC or non-district school systems. Regi Huerter mentioned an Act mandating School districts to accept credits for homeless youth. - Truancy Study Group – The group is reviewing current legislation dealing with truancy and will discuss the values and perspectives of the judicial system. Should Truancy issues brought to Court?
<p>Issue/Topic: Overview and recap of the work of the Juvenile TF – where we are in the process?</p>	<p>Regi Huerter suggested a discussion that would define a strategic framework and identify the values of services delivered to Colorado’s youth and families based on their assessed needs and equitable access to programs, information and resources.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: Examination of sample case: How do the values that the TF has previously determined apply to this case.</p>	<p>The group engaged in a case study discussion.</p> <p><i>Entities involved in the case</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child: Case started when child very young. Hasn’t done anything. When victimized, her needs were not met. Rejected by family. IQ low and no assessment of the child needs. Accountability of the child when placed in TRCCF by hitting back. • Parents: The mother has mental health issues. The father kept the child at home to ensure the duties that the mother was unable to do. The child was kept from attending school – The parents did not comply with the health care plan for the child when assaulted. The grandparents did not recognize child as own. • School: Child not fitting in at school because hygiene, victim at school, and then at home – The School filed a Dependency & Neglect case –Where is the info reported of missing school time and D & N? • Court - Dependency & Neglect was filed by school. Defense and Prosecutors and, Guardian ad Litem involved when the child was placed. • Placement: No consistency in any placements. Different behavioral evaluations, diagnostics, and treatment. Because of multiple placements, nobody made connection with the child. • Human services: Adoptive agency, DHS filed petition based upon hygiene concerns of the child. <p><u>Discussion Points</u></p> <p>- Issue of information sharing between TFCCF in various counties.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Different assessments and diagnostics as counties have different missions and expectations on policies. - Different assessments if performed by Human Services or Court system (full assessment). - Issue of the placement choice based on availability of resources. - Issue of management of behavioral health: managed differently if the child is placed within a TRCCF or within NYC. Note: A TRCCF cannot physically manage a child. The group will further study rules around licensure about placement.
<p>Issue/Topic: Full discussion about how society should respond and evaluation of our work so far. How does it fit in and how should we adjust it.</p>	<p>What should be the values of assessment shared by the different systems?</p> <p><u>Discussions points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of a mission statement across the different systems/entities. - Inconsistencies between the 22 districts and the 64 counties and assessment not performed everywhere – House Bill 1451 Collaborative Management Program passed in 2004 calling for the development of collaborative management of multiagency services to coordinate services for children and families. - Issue of funding sources being a driving factor more than values. A child could be pulled out of a system due to funding running out. Should the funding be appropriated to youth instead of systems? - Issue of limited available resources for mental health. Judicial has discretion to determine if mental ill child or criminal/ delinquent but limited resources available and adapted to child. NYC is providing these services but child has to be committed. Should the system be re-shaped so there is no necessary commitment to provide mental health services? NYC used to be called Youth services. - Risks (to self and others) and needs assessment and continuum of intervention. Identify the system(s) that are meant to provide a continuum of care. <p><u>What Next?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Shaping of a model: Assessment - Case planning – Continuum of care including services and assessment of needs and risks. Factors to consider: Family ability to care for, school roles, youth needs and risks, systems of juvenile justice when child is at risk to self or to others, more secure placement. ➤ Review of the missions and funding strings across the system. ➤ Looking at structures changes– Consolidation of early childhood. ➤ Additional Data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who is getting out of NYC and how they are getting released? - Report issued by Texas Appleseed on Texas’ School-to-Prison Pipeline’: http://www.texasappleseed.net/pdf/Pipeline%20Report.pdf
<p>Issue/Topic: Next meeting</p>	<p>The Juvenile Justice Task Force will be welcoming Judie Crow from the Department of Human Services as a new member.</p> <p>Next meeting is on October 20, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the Juvenile Assessment Center.</p> <p>Meeting adjourned at 12:02 pm.</p>